IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

1. WRIT PETITION NO.2878 OF 2005

Mrs Savitri Janardan Mali, .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

WITH

2. WRIT PETITION NO.2879 OF 2005

Narayan Hiru Monde, .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

WITH

3. WRIT PETITION NO.2880 OF 2005

Ramdas Kamlu Patil .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

WITH

4. WRIT PETITION NO.2881 OF 2005

Ganpat Babu Dabhane .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

WITH

5. WRIT PETITION NO.2882 OF 2005

Mrs Savitri Janardan Mali, .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

WITH

6. WRIT PETITION NO.2883 OF 2005

Mrs Sharda Hemant Patil .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

WITH

7. WRIT PETITION NO.2884 OF 2005

Eknath Laxman Patil .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

WITH

8. WRIT PETITION NO.2885 OF 2005

Sanjay Shama Bhoir .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

WITH

9. WRIT PETITION NO.2886 OF 2005

Madhukar Kashinath Patil .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

10. WRIT PETITION NO.2887 OF 2005

Bhagirath Pandurang Chorage .. Petitioner.
Vs
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr G.Hiranandani with Mr C.G.Gavnekar, for the petitioner.

Mr S.V.Gavand, for Respondent nos 1 and 2.

Mrs M.P.Thakur, AGP for respondent-State in W.P.Nos 2878/05 to 2882/05.

Mr R.M.Patne, AGP in W.P.Nos 2883/05 to 2887/05.

CORAM : V.G.PALSHIKAR & D.B.BHOSALE,JJ.
DATE : 15.9.2005.

PC:

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. By these petitions, the petitioners have challenged the election process of Panvel Agricultural Produce Market Committee, Panvel. By an interim order, the elections were directed to be held but the results were not to be declared without prior permission of this Court. By our order dated 26.8.2005, we permitted declaration of the results. According to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the results are not so far declared.

3. In view of the fact that we have already ordered declaration of the results on 26.8.2005, nothing survives in these writ petitions. The petitioners will have a remedy of challenging the result of the election by way of Election Petition provided under the Act. That being the remedy available to the petitioners, we see no reason to keep these writ petitions pending further. These writ petitions are dismissed.

(D.B.BHOSALE, J.) **(V.G.PALSHIKAR, J.)**